

LEGISLATING EXCELLENCE? ONE STATE'S RESPONSE TO MANDATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

Background

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), policymakers often step in to make changes when management fails, and these efforts rarely have the desired effect within organizations. This phenomenon has been experienced in Illinois in recent years regarding the professional development of teachers. The State's policymakers responded to calls from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) regarding teacher quality and followed suit by establishing Illinois Professional Teaching Standards as well as additional legislation to increase the degree to which Illinois teachers engage in professional development (Bradley, Beckwith, & Price, 2001).

In 1997, the Illinois legislature passed House Bill 542 (Public Act 90-548) which changed teacher tenure requirements to a four-year, multi-tiered system that called for the accumulation of professional development credit for all teachers. According to the Bill, all Illinois teachers had to have Certificate Renewal Plans approved by local councils known as the Local Professional Development Council (LPDC) by 2002 and thereafter. Each plan must include the following: a minimum of three personal goals for improvement, the professional teaching or content standards related to those goals, proposed professional development activities that will help the teacher to achieve those goals, and a time line for completing the professional development activities. In addition, each plan has to include enough professional development activities to generate 120 units (contact hours) over a five-year period. The units can be achieved through university coursework, workshops, or other activities offered by approved providers. The LPDC committees developed to review the plans are to be made up of three classroom teachers, one administrator, and one member-at-large who could be an administrator, a parent, or a business/community member.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to examine district responses to the 1997 legislation. To what degree, if any, did legislative requirements regarding the professional development of teachers affect the manner and means through which districts provided professional development for their teachers? Because the nature of this study provided the opportunity to discuss professional development with key stakeholders across the state, a three-part secondary purpose emerged: to identify the variety of district practices regarding professional development across the state; to determine the degree to which professional development may be occurring within the schools themselves with the responsibilities distrib-

uted to teachers and building level administrators; and to identify potential opportunities for universities to become involved in the professional development needs of Illinois schools.

Methods

This mixed-method study primarily involved the use of open-ended interviews with primary stakeholders in representative districts across the state. Districts were identified according to geography, size, socio-economic status of the student populations, and particular attention was given to represent rural, suburban, and urban settings. Initially, fifty districts were identified in a purposive sampling, and of those fifty, twenty districts agreed to participate in the project itself. The districts represented in the interviews included 30% urban districts, 30% suburban districts, and 40% rural districts. In addition, 25% of the districts represented have fewer than 1000 students. Forty percent have between 1000 and 5000 students, and 35% of the districts represented have more than 5000 students (see Appendix).

Interviews were conducted between October 2003 and July 2004 with 21 primary stakeholders in the 20 districts. These individuals included superintendents, local school administrators, and teachers (see Appendix). Stakeholders were identified by superintendents within the districts as contact people most knowledgeable about professional development and the response to the new legislation. Sixty percent of the interviews were conducted face-to-face while the remaining forty percent were conducted by phone. All interviews were taped and transcribed. A protocol of questions was used with each interview, and this protocol addressed the following: the district response to the new legislation, characterizations of the professional development within the district and the personnel primarily responsible for professional development, the role of building level administrators in professional development, and the funding of professional development. The questions were designed for open responses, and clarifying questions were posed when elaboration was needed (Seidman, 1998). In addition to the interviews, documents were examined regarding the professional development of teachers in those districts. These documents included professional development materials, meeting agendas, strategic plans, and other relevant district documentation.

The data collected from the interviews and documents were analyzed based on a constant comparative analysis to find themes and possible tensions related to professional development and the response to the legislation both within and among districts (Miles & Huberman, 1993; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Following the initial qualitative analysis, a second level of analysis was done with the initial data based upon a cartographic representation of graduate degrees among teachers in the state (Fisher, 1982). While the percentages of teachers with graduate degrees from each of the districts across the state were plotted using cartography software, the analysis focused on the twenty districts included in the study. This second level of analysis was conducted to inform state univer-

sities of the potential needs and opportunities regarding the professional development of teachers.

Results

Based upon the interview data and the document analysis, six themes emerged regarding Illinois schools' responses to the mandated certification renewal as well as their general characterization of their professional development. These themes involve the following: the relationship between professional development and a district's strategic plan; varied formats for delivery of professional development; creative uses of human resources for professional development; relationships between districts and universities with respect to professional development; overall effects of the new recertification policy; and the financing of professional development. The Certification Renewal Plans did not emerge as a theme because the individuals interviewed did not mention them in any significant manner. They responded to direct questions regarding the new policy, but they did not indicate any other significant effects based upon the plans.

Professional Development and Strategic Planning

In seven of the interviews, professional development was integrally related to the districts' strategic plans and the schools' improvement plans. In each case, district administrators linked professional development to the formation, implementation, and/or assessment of those plans. In District A, all the goals that they established for their district directly related to professional development. Therefore, they were able to create a professional development plan for their district that was an embedded and integral part of the vision they had for their district. According to the district administrator, all of the planning for the district fits together: the school improvement plans must be aligned with the district goals, and the money they spend on professional development is tied to the school improvement plans, so all the district efforts and financial resources are directed toward the goals of the district to improve student learning. He noted, "We make no bones about it...professional development is the largest piece and the most critical factor in improving student learning."

District G generated a theme for its professional development that fit its strategic plan: "Reaching, Teaching, and Assessing All Students." They developed this theme to move away from what they had seen as the "annual hodgepodge" with their previous professional development efforts. They also used the theme as a means through which teachers and schools assessed their work. District leaders wanted something bigger driving the professional development of their teachers and the assessment of their strategic plan. The District G administrator noted, "...anything we did, that was the litmus test. Does it fit within the umbrella, and is it going to reach, teach, and assess all students?"

The integration of strategic planning and professional development also appeared to help districts to prepare for significant initiatives.

For example, District E recognized that they needed to prepare for some of the initiatives outlined within their own strategic plan rather than rush into them poorly prepared. The administrator interviewed noted that one of the seven points within the school's strategic plan involved multi-age education, yet the school chose to spend one year learning about multi-age grouping through conference attendance, study groups, and consultation before implementing it as part of the school program. After a year of significant professional development regarding the initiative, the school then implemented multi-age grouping to a limited degree and continued to study its effects. Therefore, the school used its strategic plan and its emphasis in professional development to successfully implement broad initiatives within the school.

Format of Professional Development

In spite of the innovations articulated within a number of strategic plans, most interviewees noted that obstacles of time, space, and other resources continued to influence the format of what they offered their teachers. Respondents from every district studied indicated that finding substitute teachers was a significant obstacle for them. When asked about professional development during the day, District K's school principal noted the following, "We are reluctant because we are suffering the same as every other school in the state. You can't find substitutes for teachers, so during the day professional development is very rare now." Because of the shortage of substitutes and funds to pay for substitutes, personnel from fifteen of the districts indicated that they offer most of their professional development after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer. However, some districts have attempted to find alternative times in which to offer professional development to their teachers. For example, to deal with the difficulty of offering professional development during the school day, Districts G and R officially altered the contracts of their teachers and extended the days they work each year to add two additional days for professional development. District B offered two-day conferences for their teachers before school begins in the fall. District C offered mini-conferences during the teachers' professional development days. In addition, District D used instructional specialists to offer side-by-side coaching with feedback and reflection.

Six districts noted that district-wide initiatives that require training over time impose a heavy financial burden. The District K administrator described year-long, district-wide initiatives within his district. The high school worked on block scheduling while the elementary teachers addressed appropriate instruction. He indicated that the district had to spend a great deal of money on training sessions for all teachers. District G described the financial investment they made in order to implement a district-wide elementary reading assessment program. The district spent a year and a half preparing administrators and a contact teacher for each school before they began to implement the training for all teachers.

Human Resources and Professional Development

How are districts using their own personnel to develop and implement professional development? The seven larger districts studied have at least one person within their central offices whose primary responsibility is professional development. The remaining districts had at least one individual at the central level who worked with professional development as one of many responsibilities. In District A, the central office had two individuals involved in professional development as assistant superintendents for instruction and school improvement. In addition, that district had a Title I coordinator who did a significant amount of professional development in conjunction with that program. According to the administrator from this district, “...as far as leadership positions, I think we commit a fair percent of the manpower in the central office to professional development initiatives.”

Some shifts from central level delivery are evident across the state. The District J representative from a regional office of education (ROE) indicated that her office works with a train-the-trainers model in order to create long-term, site-based professional development. During those sessions, the ROE representative works with school teams that include a teacher and an administrator. According to this representative, the shift from traditional modes of professional development to those more embedded within the schools themselves has been slow: “We still do the one-time things. We still do it because people want it, and they get some information, but we’re really trying to get site-based, long-term professional development that they have a vested interest in. It’s slow. It’s slow.”

In other districts, the distribution of professional development has become a critical element of the organizational structure. In District O, the administrator indicated that one hundred percent of their professional development has been conducted by teachers. These teachers within the district were identified according to strengths and areas of expertise. Others were sent to conferences to learn about new strategies and ideas. These teachers were then paid to conduct professional development sessions after school hours, in the summer, and on Saturdays. This same district also employs a full-time grant writer who wrote enough grants to fund most of the district’s professional development. The District O administrator noted that having the grant writer has provided additional resources for more professional development, and this has resulted in higher levels of student achievement.

In District D, one administrator oversaw both professional development and hiring. She believed her role creates a seamless system of support for teachers from the point of hiring onward. She identified 20 key individuals who serve at the local school level to offer professional support. These specialists were teachers who focus on specific needs within the district. These instructional specialists were available district-wide to provide professional development within the schools with small groups or grade levels. They also worked with individual teachers when needed. In addition, District D had an instructional specialist in every school.

In order to effectively distribute the creation and implementation

of professional development within schools, two districts created significant support structures for building level administrators. In District D, administrators met on a monthly basis to develop their capacity to facilitate professional development at their schools. In addition, principals had cluster meetings following the monthly meetings to help coach one another about professional development. District A held meetings for its principals every two weeks. These meetings were also designed to support professional development at the local school level. According to the District A administrator, the district focused its efforts around the Baldridge Model (George, 1992) and continuous improvement.

Universities and Professional Development

Based on the interviews and the analysis of the cartographic data regarding teachers with graduate degrees, universities were not frequently sought as sources of professional development. Interviews from four of the districts studied indicated that they have established partnerships with universities to support their teachers' professional development. District P described a master's cohort program within their district where half of the courses were taught by university faculty and half were taught by school personnel. The district administrator noted, "Their instructors teach half the courses and the teachers teach the other half, and they design the coursework to match the vision of engaged learning and the kinds of things we feel are important for our teachers." The administrator of District D also mentioned a professional development school (PDS) that it had established with a state university as an important source of professional development. According to this administrator, the mentor teachers in the district learn as much over the course of the year as the interns, and the program has helped the teacher-mentors to become effective mentors for new teachers in the district. In a third district, District P, the building administrator indicated that her school had a partnership with a state university. Her teachers taught courses for the university, and the preservice teachers would have some of their methods courses and observations in their building. In addition, teachers in her building were involved with the university in conducting action research and writing grants. Finally, the administrator in District O indicated that she was on leave for a year as a teacher in residence for a state university. In this capacity she worked with their teacher education program, but she did not elaborate on how this relationship explicitly affected the professional development of teachers in her district.

Not all of the comments regarding district-university relations, however, were positive. In fact, the administrator from District M indicated that she had developed an extensive program of district-sponsored courses in part because of very negative experiences she had with the local university. The district offered ten to twelve courses each year that teachers could apply to increases on the salary schedule. Less than 30% of the teachers in this district have graduate degrees in spite of the fact that the university is, figuratively speaking, in its back yard. The district administrator from District G also indicated that he did not seek out the

nearby university for help with professional development. He noted, "...they're trying to reach out to school districts and trying to get some of their professional types out into the field and trying to do some partnerships. It's a real struggle for them." He also noted that universities need to rethink their relationships with districts and not expect the districts to come to them. He believed universities need to focus more on outreach and the use of district cohorts to serve the needs of the state.

The cartographic representation of teachers with graduate degrees across the state showed similar concerns regarding university relationships—particularly to those districts closest to their campuses. With the exception of two areas, one rural and the other urban/suburban, the districts closest to state universities had low to average percentages of teachers with graduate degrees—primarily ranging from 20 to 40%. What was evident across the state was also represented by the districts in this study. Of the six districts in the study that were located 20 miles or less from state universities, three had only 20–30% of their teachers holding graduate degrees. Two districts have 30–40% of their teachers with graduate degrees, and one district has 50–60% of its teachers holding graduate degrees.

The Effects of the New Recertification Policy

In 18 of the 20 districts studied, district administrators noted that the new recertification process had influenced their efforts regarding professional development but not in ways the legislature had most likely hoped. The process created more paperwork and diverted time, energy, and resources away from actual professional development in order to handle the management issues of the new requirements. Further, the process shifted the nature of motivation for professional development from professionalism toward gate keeping and accountability. District E administrator noted, "I think it's an awful lot of paperwork and an awful lot of hoop jumping...What have I seen that's changed? Well, I think it's heightened the stress level of a lot of people. I think unnecessarily, frankly...." Others interviewed shared her sentiments. For example, in District A the superintendent had to hire someone to handle the paperwork of the plans. This took money away from other areas of professional development.

An ROE representative from District J described how they had to rapidly develop support mechanisms for teachers regarding the procedural details for completing their plans. Within months of the publication of the manual, the office conducted seven or eight after-school sessions in which teachers came to learn about the process. The regional officer noted that this process significantly and unexpectedly taxed the office's time and resources. She indicated, "But that hit us totally in the face because we weren't ready for it. And it took a lot of time...."

In addition to diverting energy and resources away from professional development, the new legislation undermined a sense of professionalism in many districts. The principal in District B indicated that one-third of her faculty had master's degrees and a number of them were working toward national board certification, yet she believed the recertifi-

cation process did not honor this level of professionalism. Regarding the professional climate within her school, the principal concluded:

It's (the school) very much a culture where we think of ourselves as learners and teachers. The state certification renewal process, quite frankly, is seen as a burden. I mean it doesn't really make anything better. I just think of it as a big burden. I mean, it doesn't motivate. It doesn't direct. It doesn't focus.

Further, the District J ROE representative noted that teachers' motivation for professional development shifted with the new legislation. She noted that teachers used to come to professional development in order to learn and improve their teaching. Now, this staff developer noted that many teachers come simply for credit. The administrator in District F echoed these sentiments.

From the responses in the interviews, most districts are not changing their professional development efforts in response to the new legislation. They have taken significant efforts to prevent the legislation from negatively affecting what they consider to be strong efforts they have made in the past. District D administrator noted, "Our superintendent from the very beginning said he did not want the new legislation or teacher recertification to drive professional development in our district...." The District G administrator also indicated that they were not making changes according to the new legislation. He indicated that the teachers were responsible for fulfilling the new requirements in terms of documentation, and the system continued to offer extensive professional development that could be applied to the new requirements. The administrator of District P likewise responded that their professional development had not changed; the legislation merely created more hoops to jump through. The interviewee from District K indicated that his district's efforts had not changed, but how they approached them did. He noted, "I think the same people are doing the same developmental things. However, it has made us more aware of what we are doing and it is forcing us to reflect a little more." Ultimately, it appears that good systems implementing good professional development have maintained their high standards in spite of the new legislation.

Professional Development and Financing

This study found a number of troubling points regarding financing and professional development in Illinois. Most troubling, in the same year that the State legislators initiated a mandate that recertification is based upon professional development, they rescinded the state block grant for professional development, and they did this in June—long after professional development had been planned for the year.

Every district interviewed indicated that losing the professional development block grant created a significant financial hardship. The District G administrator noted that his district lost \$90,000 with the rescission of the block grant. He also indicated that his district was able to offset half of the loss through their general funds, but they were able to do that only because the district chose to safeguard those funds at the expense of other

items within their school budget. The District D administrator noted that her district lost \$97,000 otherwise allocated for professional development. She likewise indicated that her district was attempting to make up the difference.

Also troubling, administrators who were interviewed could not or would not disclose how much money they were spending on professional development. One possible reason for the lack of specificity was that funds were being used from a number of sources: specific line items within the district budget, grant monies, salary, as well as percentages of money provided by Title Grants. However, challenges regarding the multiple sources of funding were only one explanation for the lack of information. The District G administrator offered another reason for the lack of specificity. He noted that when funding gets tight, school boards have to find areas to cut, and professional development is often an easy target. Therefore, districts scatter the money around so their boards do not know exactly how much they are spending on professional development. This helps to protect the funds from being diverted to other budgetary needs.

Lessons for Leadership

In an era when the rhetoric regarding school improvement and accountability are pervasive, everyone needs to remember that professional development and collaboration are the primary vehicles through which we can achieve school improvement. As Darling-Hammond (1999) notes, “Democratic schools cannot evolve or survive without strong cords of commitment and shared learning that bind teachers to one another and powerful teaching that connects young people to their future” (p. 32). Sarason (1982) concurs, and he exposes the implications regarding student achievement when he notes, “It is virtually impossible to create and sustain over time conditions for productive learning for students when they do not exist for teachers” (p. 45).

With the connection between professional development and school improvement in mind, it is crucial that stakeholders see schools and districts not merely as entities within which professional development happens. Instead, they must see schools and districts as learning organizations within which professional development cannot be separated or isolated (Fullan, 1993; Senge, 1994). It is not enough to satisfy externally imposed credit requirements or to develop professional support that is aligned with the district mission and strategic plan. Rather professional development and collaboration must be embedded within schools as key parts of the district structure and culture. When all stakeholders see schools and school districts as learning organizations, educators are better able to examine the complex challenges and potential of the organization itself. Rather than focusing on the technical elements of external programs, they can explore the significance of their organization’s structures and use of resources—human, fiscal, and otherwise. Further, they can explore the significance of relationships among all stakeholders. With this in mind, six lessons for leaders can be gleaned from this examination of professional development in Illinois.

First, if professional development is supposed to be more than the sum of its parts, it needs to be driven by an idea that is bigger than the sum of the small ideas represented within and among those parts, and this bigger idea should be the essence of a district's strategic plan. Of the 20 districts studied, those that had the most coherent professional development programs and the most effective use of district resources tied their professional development directly to their strategic plans. Professional development was a big part of who they were. It became embedded in the operations of their districts and their schools. This evinces what Senge (1994) claims about the power of vision. As Senge (1994) notes, a vision, when shared by all within an organization, becomes a powerful force that can offer a focus for the collective energy of all stakeholders. He explains: "A shared vision is not an idea. It is, rather, a force in people's hearts, a force of impressive power.... Few, if any, forces in human affairs are as powerful as a shared vision" (p. 206).

Second, creating a learning organization requires a significant investment in its human resources. Those districts that demonstrated the greatest degree of professional support for their teachers did so because they held professional development as a high priority, and, as such, they were willing to use district funds to support their efforts. For instance, District D in this study demonstrated a high level of commitment to professional development by virtue of the investment in and creative use of human resources. This district of a little over 7,000 students and 13 schools designated a minimum of 33 positions to professional development (20 teachers on special assignment and 13 instructional specialists). Likewise, District O, a district of 8,000 students and 11 schools, created and sustained a structure of distributive leadership wherein teachers provide all of the professional development and a grant writer helps to secure additional funds to support professional development in the district. Further, Districts D and A were committed to significant professional development of their building level administrators to ensure that professional development supports the teachers, the school improvement plans, and the district strategic plans.

Third, to truly maximize the potential of a school or district as a learning organization, stakeholders must develop creative solutions to the challenges they face. Data within this study did reveal innovative responses to certain challenges districts faced. For example, District O hired a full-time grant writer to secure additional funds for professional development, and their efforts at this point appear to be very successful. In District D, model teachers were pulled from their classrooms to serve as instructional specialists so that teachers could get substantive, embedded support regarding their instruction. Other districts described efforts to develop train-the-trainers models to better utilize the professional perspectives and experiences of their teachers.

While a number of districts across the state are rethinking how they provide professional support for their teachers, most still operate within certain structural and financial "givens," including the lack of substitute teachers and the subsequent use of after school and summer schedules for

the bulk of their professional development. What is significant regarding this issue is not as much what was said during the interviews but, rather, what was not said. No district mentioned committees or task forces to address the issue of time. Further, no district mentioned the use of technology as a means through which the issue of time could be reconsidered.

Fourth, all educators in the state, preschool through post-secondary, need to recognize their professional interdependence regarding not only pre-service but also in-service teacher education and leadership development, and they need to seek innovative means of collaboration. Collaboration took on a number of forms in the districts studied—both within and among districts. Some districts indicated that they worked closely with their Regional Offices of Education. District G noted that it collaborates with a neighboring district regarding Eisenhower grant money. However, based on what was not said in the interviews about substantive partnerships between and among potential stakeholders, districts in Illinois have significant untapped potential for what Fullan (2003, p. 47) refers to as “lateral development” wherein they build capacity across their districts by virtue of the meaningful connections they make regarding professional development.

Four districts, D, N, O, and P, noted partnerships they have with universities, but all these partnerships centered around teacher preparation. None of the districts noted partnerships for leadership preparation. As Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, and Creighten (2005) contend, partnerships between educational leadership programs and school districts can provide seamless leadership development to support and sustain high quality leadership. Partnerships between schools and universities are not new. The Professional Development School (PDS) model has now entered its second decade. While data from this study indicate that a number of teacher education programs have established partnerships with some of these districts, more formal and substantive partnerships between universities and local schools for leadership development could create additional opportunities to develop networks of support for professional development at the local school and district levels.

Fifth, evidence from the schools studied indicates that securing funding for professional development will continue to be a challenge. Districts will need to seek external funding to augment the funds available from their local budgets. Hiring a grant writer, as District O has done, is a promising approach to secure additional external funds. In addition, school and district personnel need to show their school boards the empirical benefits of professional development. University partnerships could provide much needed support for both grant writing and research and program assessment.

Finally, in order to continue to nurture professional development and collaboration, schools and districts must see themselves as learning organizations. When districts identify themselves as learning organizations, their values and relationships become more important than externally mandated processes and procedures. This shift in focus can help districts to effectively negotiate bureaucratic constraints such as the recertification requirements in Illinois. If professional development and collaboration become more integral to the organizational structure and culture of schools, other elements in the

operation of schools will also change. As seen in Districts D, A, and others, principals will then be more able to see themselves as instructional leaders within their buildings, and they will not separate professional development from the daily operations of their school (Fullan, 1996). In addition, just as the principal will not separate his or her role from the instructional leadership of the school, the nature and content of teachers' professional development and collaboration will be integrally tied to student achievement.

Limitations

The limitations of the study include the sample of 20 districts from a state with about 890 districts, which challenges the degree to which those interviewed represent the state. There are a number of innovative practices and meaningful partnerships throughout the state that are not represented in this study. Therefore, the results have to be valued for potential themes rather than indicating any level of generalizability. In addition, because the study relied on the willingness of participants to discuss their districts and their efforts for professional development, the voices of districts struggling with professional development or those that do not value professional development are under-represented. Therefore, the study cannot conclude that the legislation for professional development has no value. It may, in fact, have a positive influence on those districts that were not supporting the professional development of teachers prior to its passing. The study, can and does, however, substantiate tensions and concerns in those districts that were already supporting professional development before passage of this legislation.

Conclusions

What can we learn by examining one state's responses to mandated professional development? Examination of these districts' efforts to create and sustain professional development for their teachers revealed once again long-standing challenges and opportunities for professional development, creative approaches to nurturing human resources, and potential for more collaboration with universities and among schools and districts. In addition, district responses to the 1997 legislation in Illinois offers a potential case study of state-level bureaucracy and its effects.

Adler and Borys (1996) distinguish between two types of bureaucracy—coercive and enabling. Coercive bureaucracies can prescribe roles and relationships, inhibit creative leadership, and deprofessionalize teachers and administrators. In contrast, enabling bureaucracies can reduce role conflict and ambiguity and streamline policies and procedures in order to promote innovation. Did the Illinois House Bill 542 create coercive or enabling bureaucracy for schools? Evidence from this study seems to imply the former, but additional research would be needed to explore this conclusion and its implications for all districts in the state, particularly those that had not had good systems of professional development prior to the legislation.

References

Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *The Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1).

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bradley, C., Beckwith, J., & Price, A. (2001, March). *Illinois educational recertification: Impact on local, regional, and state control*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Finance Association, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED455588)

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Target time toward teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20(2), 31–6.

Fisher, H. (1982). *Mapping information: The graphic display of quantitative information*. Cambridge, MA: ABT.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. New York: Falmer.

Fullan, M. (1996). Professional culture and educational change. *School Psychology Review*, 26(4), 496–500.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

George, S. (1992). *The Baldridge Quality System: The do-it-yourself way to transform your business*. New York: Wiley.

Glauser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods* (2nd ed.). Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

Sarason, S. (1982). *The culture of school and the problem of change* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Senge, P. (1994). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency.

Young, M. D., Crow, G., Orr, M. T., Ogawa, R., & Creighton, T. (2005). *An educative look at "Educating School Leaders": UCEA, AERA, & NCPEA leaders respond to Arthur Levine's report "Educating School Leaders."* Austin, TX: University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved April 26, 2007, from <http://www.ucea.org/pdf/EducLeadersRespMar18.pdf>

Donna A. Breault is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Appendix

Information About Districts Studied

Dist.	Geog.	Size	SES (% free and reduced lunch)	Prox. to closest public univ. (in miles)	% of teach- ers with graduate degrees	Interviewees			Documents analyzed			
						Superinten- dent or dis- trict admin.	School admin.	Teacher rep.	ROE	Stratge- ic plans	Mission statement	Prof. dev. materials
A	urban	6,400	57%	<100	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
B	rural	1,200	41%	>50	50–60%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C	suburb	1,400	62%	<20	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
D	suburb	7,000	29%	<50	50–60%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
E	urban	14,000	60%	<20	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F	rural	2,900	30%	<20	50–60%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
G	suburb	3,260	12%	<20	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
H	rural	470	10%	<50	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I	rural	3,800	15%	<100	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
J	urban	13,000	66%	<20	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
K	rural	450	40%	<50	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
L	urban	1,900	35%	<100	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
M	suburb	5,400	44%	<20	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
N	rural	700	49%	<50	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
O	urban	7,000	33%	<50	40–50%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
P	urban	6,682	4%	<50	40–50%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Q	rural	530	20%	<50	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
R	suburb	4,800	53%	<50	20–30%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
S	urban	3,000	49%	<50	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
T	rural	800	36%	>50	30–40%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x